



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/519,394	12/22/2004	Christoph Siegelin	76.0733/PR	2863
41754	7590	08/01/2007	EXAMINER	
THE JANSSON FIRM 9501 N. CAPITAL OF TX HWY #202 AUSTIN, TX 78759			CHRZANOWSKI, MATTHEW R	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		2186		
		MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
		08/01/2007	PAPER	

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>
	10/519,394	SIEGELIN ET AL.
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>
	Matthew R. Chrzanowski	2186

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 May 2007.
- 2a) This action is FINAL.                    2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-31 is/are pending in the application.
  - 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-31 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
  - a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:
    1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
    2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
    3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____.

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Claim Objections*

1. **Claims 19, 20 and 21** objected to because of the following informalities:

Applicant amended the claims to the following: “**wherein the write is carried out in an active physical area** if the content of the logical area is identical to the content of the active physical area or when said write involves no erasure, **the write is carried out in an active physical area**”. Examiner assumes Applicant meant to amend the claims such as amended claim 9 to state: “wherein if the content of the logical area is identical to the content of the active physical area or when said write involves no erasure, the write is carried out in an active physical area...” Appropriate correction is required.

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112*

2. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

3. **Claims 1-31** rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. **Claim 1** was amended to include “associating

**simultaneously and permanently** at least two physical areas of said memory, called mirror areas, with a same logical area (*page 5 of 18*)" and **claim 11, 12, and 13** similarly (*pages 6-7 of 18*). However, the specification does not distinctly disclose the association happens simultaneously and is permanent. Applicant points to page 2, paragraphs [0034], [0035] and [0037] of the published application (*Remarks: page 14 of 18, first paragraph*) to show support for amendment, which in fact suggests changing an association as the specification states:

"a simple RAM counter, associated with the logical area, containing the number of the active area. The area is changed by incrementing the counter (*page 2, paragraph [0035] of published application; or page 6, lines 5-11 of specification*); and

"A second realisation consists in a bit field in FLASH, associated with the logical area. Each bit represents the use state of a physical area... The change of physical area is carried out by programming (*page 2, paragraph [0037] of published application; or page 6, lines 14- 20 of the specification*)."

**Claims 2-9, and 14-31** are dependent upon **claims 1, and 11-13** and therefore rejected.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.
3. **Claims 1-2, 11, 13, and 23** rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ban (WO 94/20906 hereinafter “Ban”).

Consider **claims 1 and 13**, Ban discloses a method to write in flash type memory (*flash memory, abstract; method (i.e., software, or firmware of hardware)...*, page 2, lines 7-10) of an electronic module comprising:

associating simultaneously (*original creation of the virtual map entry*) at least two physical areas of said memory (*flash memory physical address locations*, page 2, line 21), called mirror areas, with a same logical area for storing a content (*fixed-length group of physical byte addresses form a logical block*, page 3, lines 1-2; *one or more physically contiguous flash memory areas or zones comprise a number of blocks*, page 3, lines 4-7; *therefore the physical byte addresses are associated with logical blocks, zones and units*, FIG. 2, 3, & 7);

designating one of the physical areas as being an active physical area; and during a write (*abstract*) to said logical area, programming the content of said logical area into the active area (*flash memory system which “allows data to be continuously written to unwritten physical address*

*locations," abstract; data cannot be written to an area of flash memory in which data has previously been written, unless the area is first erased, so the area is blank when programming page 1, lines 26-29) (page 7, lines 1 - page 9, line 22 and page 13, claim 1).*

However, Ban may not specifically disclose associating permanently at least two physical areas of said memory called mirror areas, with a same logical area. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to associate permanently at least two physical areas of said memory called mirror areas, with a same logical area in the system of Ban, because a permanent is a special temporal case of dynamically capable (*if an association via a table is capable of changing, however throughout its entire life, the table is not changed then in fact the dynamically changeable table was actually permanent or fixed*) and permanent associating does not require complicated or complex control mechanisms for controlling the change of association.

Consider **claims 2 and 23**, and as applied to **claims 1 and 13** above, Ban discloses the method further comprising erasing the content of all mirror areas used in a single operation at a convenient time ("One or more physically contiguous flash memory areas (called zones) that can be physically erased using suitable prior art flash memory technology comprise a unit and each unit contains an integral number of blocks," page 3, lines 4-7; there is a zone erase

*operation that erases the unit that includes that block, and unit containing the logical block consisting of multiple physical address locations are therefore all erased, the page 3, lines 24-25) (page 7, lines 1 - page 9, line 22 and page 13, claim 1).*

Consider **claim 11**, Ban discloses an electronic module having information processing means (*the device writes and stores data, abstract*) and comprising a flash type non volatile memory (*flash memory, abstract*) having a mirror memory formed from at least two physical areas (*flash memory physical address locations, page 2, line 21*) simultaneously (*original creation of the virtual map entry*) associated with the same logical area (*fixed-length group of physical byte addresses form a logical block, page 3, lines 1-2; one or more physically contiguous flash memory areas or zones comprise a number of blocks, page 3, lines 4-7; therefore the physical byte addresses are associated with logical blocks, zones and units, FIG. 2, 3, & 7*), each new programming operation in said logical area taking place in an area of the mirror memory(*flash memory system which "allows data to be continuously written to unwritten physical address locations," abstract; data cannot be written to an area of flash memory in which data has previously been written, unless the area is first erased, so the area is blank when programming page 1, lines 26-29) (page 7, lines 1 - page 9, line 22 and page 13, claim 1*).

However, Ban may not specifically disclose associating permanently at least two physical areas of said memory called mirror areas, with a same logical area. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to associate permanently at least two physical areas of said memory called mirror areas, with a same logical area in the system of Ban, because a permanent is a special temporal case of dynamic (*if an association via a table is capable of changing, however throughout its entire life, the table is not changed then in fact the dynamically changeable table was actually permanent or fixed*) and permanent associating does not require complicated or complex control mechanisms for controlling the change of association.

4. **Claims 3, 7-8, 18, 24, and 28-29** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ban (WO 94/20906 hereinafter “Ban”) as applied to **claims 1-2, 13, and 23** above, and further in view of Assar et al. (WO 95/10083 hereinafter “Assar”).

Consider **claims 3 and 24**, and as applied to **claims 2 and 23** above, Ban discloses the method wherein there is a convenient time as described above in claim 2 and 23.

However, Ban does not disclose the method comprising performing the erasure during a period of inactivity or when all the mirror physical areas are used.

Assar discloses a method comprising performing an erasure when all the mirror physical areas are used (*when physical memory is filled, blocks with certain flags set are erased, wherein as described above blocks contain multiple physical mirror areas, page 20, lines 10-19*).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to perform an erasure when all the mirror physical areas are used in the system of Ban, because Assar teaches it is necessary to erase some data when a memory is full in order to place new data in a flash memory (*page 20, lines 10-19*).

Consider **claim 7 and 28**, and as applied to **claim 1 and 13** above, Ban discloses the method comprising designating said active physical areas (*active unit made up of active blocks, FIG. 7; page 9, lines 27-30; page 10, line 1*).

However, Ban does not disclose the method comprising designating said active physical areas using a counter and incrementing the counter on each change of active area.

Assar discloses a method comprising designating active physical areas using a counter (*counter 620 page 18, lines 26-page 19, line 1; page 20, line 17 and 26; counter 620 is used in conjunction with flags such as the used/free flag 112*) and incrementing the counter on each change of active area (*page 20, lines 10-19*).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to designate active physical areas using a counter in the system of Ban, because Assar teaches a counter is used to show the number of times a block has been erased and written (which areas are most and least worn out) in order to determine where to write next (*page 18, lines 26-28; abstract*).

Consider **claims 8 and 29**, and as applied to **claims 1 and 13** above, Ban discloses the method of claims 1 and 13.

However, Ban does not disclose the method comprising associating at least one bit with a logical area to represent the use state of at least one mirror physical area of said logical area.

Assar discloses a method comprising associating at least one bit (*one bit used flag 626, page 18, line 36*) with a logical area (*data block, page 18, lines 31-37*) to represent the use state of at least one mirror physical area of said logical area (*page 18, lines 35-37*).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to associate at least one bit with a logical area to represent the use state of at least one mirror physical area of said logical area in the system of Ban, because Assar teaches used/free flag is used to avoid an erase-before-write cycle and therefore avoid the overhead of an erase cycle (*page 7, lines 9-21*).

Consider **claim 18**, and as applied to **claim 7** above, Ban in view of Assar discloses the method of claim 7.

However, Ban does not disclose the method comprising associating at least one bit with a logical area representing the use state of at least one mirror physical area of said logical area.

Assar discloses a method comprising associating at least one bit (*one bit used flag 626, page 18, line 36*) with a logical area (*data block, page 18, lines 31-37*) representing the use state of at least one mirror physical area of said logical area (*page 18, lines 35-37*).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to associate at least one bit with a logical area representing the use state of at least one mirror physical area of said logical area in the system of Ban, because Assar teaches used/free flag is used to avoid an erase-before-write cycle and therefore avoid the overhead of an erase cycle (*page 7, lines 9-21*).

5. **Claims 4 and 25** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Ban (WO 94/20906 hereinafter “Ban”)** as applied to **claims 1 and 13** above, and further in view of **Mennecart (WO 01/88926 A1 hereinafter “Mennecart”)**.

Consider **claims 4 and 25**, and as applied to **claims 1 and 13** above, Ban discloses the method of claims 1 and 13.

However Ban does not disclose the method comprising copying the active physical area into a buffer area, erasing all mirror physical areas and copying the buffer into a first area available.

Mennecart discloses method comprising copying the active physical area into a buffer area (*buffer, abstract; step F5, temporary storage, FIG. 4*), erasing all mirror physical areas (*steps F3 and F3', FIG. 4*) and copying the buffer into a first area available (*page 5, line 1 – page 6, line 22; step F7, FIG. 4*).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to copy the active physical area into a buffer area, erase all mirror physical areas and copy the buffer into a first area available in the system of Ban, because Mennecart teaches the method to process a write command in memory such as EEPROM, a type of flash memory in smart cards, which reduces the time required for processing (*page 3, lines 9-35; abstract*).

6. **Claims 5 and 26** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ban (WO 94/20906 hereinafter “Ban”) as applied to claim **claims 2 and 13** above, and further in view of Hazen et al. (WO 99/35650 hereinafter “Hazen”).

Consider **claims 5 and 26**, and as applied to **claims 2 and 13** above, Ban discloses the method comprising performing an erasure as described in **claims 2 and 13**.

However, Ban does not disclose the method comprising the erasure and programming/read operations in parallel thereby not blocking the electronic module.

Hazen discloses a method comprising programming/read operations in parallel thereby not blocking an electronic module ("read-while-write operations," *title; abstract; page 2, paragraph 4; pages 5-7*).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use programming/read operations in parallel with erasure thereby blocking an electronic module in the system of Ban, because Hazen teaches simultaneous operations is desired and an advantage in a flash memory device in terms of time constraints (*page 2, paragraph 2 and page 3, paragraph 1*).

7. **Claims 6 and 27** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ban (WO 94/20906 hereinafter "Ban") in view of Hazen et al. (WO 99/35650 hereinafter "Hazen") as applied to **claims 5 and 26** above, and in view of Lipovski (US Patent # 5758148).

Consider **claims 6 and 27**, and as applied to **claims 5 and 26** above, Ban in view of Hazen discloses the method wherein comprises performing the erasure and programming/read operations in parallel, having mirror area(s), one

area being used for programming/reading while the other area is erased as described above in claims 5 and 26.

However, Ban does not disclose the method wherein comprises performing the erasure and programming/read operations in parallel in a bi-bank memory, each bank having mirror area(s), one bank being used for programming/reading while the other bank is erased, **changing active bank when all mirror areas of the bank used for programming/read have been used.**

Hazen discloses the method wherein comprises performing the erasure and programming/read operations in parallel (*one device may be written to, while the other device is being erased, page 2, paragraph 3*) in a bi-bank memory (*multiple flash memory devices, page 2, paragraph 3*), each bank having mirror areas (*as described in claims 5 and 26*), one bank being used for programming/reading while the other bank is erased (*one device may be written to, while the other device is being erased, page 2, paragraph 3*).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use programming/read operations in parallel in a bi-bank memory in the system of Ban, because Hazen teaches simultaneous operations is desired and an advantage in a flash memory device in term of time constraints (*page 2, paragraph 2; and page 3, paragraph 1*).

Lipovski discloses a method of changing an active bank when all areas of the bank used for programming/read have been used (*one memory bank*

*reaches its capacity, the system switches to the other bank to permit data writes, column 11, lines 38-42).*

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to change the active bank when all areas of the active bank have been used for programming operations in the system of Ban, because Lipovski teaches this allows to continue writing to memory without erasing the full memory bank (*column 11, lines 38-42*).

8. **Claims 9-10 and 30-31 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ban (WO 94/20906 hereinafter “Ban”) as applied to claims 1-2 and 13 above, and further in view of Kuo (US Patent # 4763305 hereinafter “Kuo”).**

Consider **claims 9 and 30**, and as applied to **claims 1 and 13** above, Ban discloses wherein the write is carried out as claims 1 and 13 above.

However, Ban does not disclose the method, wherein if the content of the logical area is identical to the content of the active physical area or when said write involves no erasure, the write is carried out in an active physical area, and in a blank physical area otherwise.

Kuo discloses a method, wherein if the content of the logical area is identical to the content of the active physical area, a write is carried out in an active physical area (*if data in the area is the same as the data to be written, then avoid the erase/program cycle the data and the write is complete for that area, column 6, lines 18-26*), and in a blank physical area otherwise (*if old data in byte*

*or block is already in erased state or blank, or the data does not match so the physical area is erased or blank and then the write is performed; column 5, lines 62-68 and column 6, lines 18-30).*

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include when the write is carried out in an active physical area if the content of the logical area is identical to the content of the active physical area or when said write involves no erasure, and in a blank physical area otherwise, in the system of Ban, because Kuo teaches this saves the time normally required to perform the erase (*column 6, lines 29-30*).

Consider **claims 10 and 31**, and as applied to **claims 9 and 30** above, Ban discloses the method comprising programming (*writing*) of the logical area in the blank physical area in claim 1 and 13.

However, Ban does not disclose the method comprising programming only a portion of the logical area in the blank physical area.

Kuo discloses a method comprising programming only part of the logical area in the blank physical area (*only erase/program those areas which need to be, those areas that new data is same as old do not need to be erased and subsequently reprogrammed, column 5, lines 62-68 and column 6, lines 18-30*).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to be able to program only part of the logical area in the blank physical area in the system of Ban, because Kuo

teaches this saves the time normally required to perform the erase (*column 6, lines 29-30*).

9. **Claim 12** rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ban (WO 94/20906 hereinafter “Ban”) and further in view of Robinson et al. (US Patent # 5375222).

Consider **claim 12**, Ban discloses an electronic module having information processing means (*the device writes and stores data, abstract*) and a flash type non volatile memory (*flash memory, abstract*) having a mirror memory formed from at least two physical areas (*flash memory physical address locations, page 2, line 21*) simultaneously (*original creation of the virtual map entry*) associated with a same logical area (*fixed-length group of physical byte addresses form a logical block, page 3, lines 1-2; one or more physically contiguous flash memory areas or zones comprise a number of blocks, page 3, lines 4-7; therefore the physical byte addresses are associated with logical blocks, zones and units, FIG. 2, 3, & 7*), each new programming operation to said logical area taking place in an area of the mirror memory (*flash memory system which “allows data to be continuously written to unwritten physical address locations,” abstract; data cannot be written to an area of flash memory in which data has previously been written, unless the area is first erased, so the area is blank when programming page 1, lines 26-29*) (page 7, lines 1 - page 9, line 22 and page 13, claim 1).

However, Ban does not disclose the flash memory module being on a card and Ban may not specifically disclose associating permanently at least two physical areas of said memory called mirror areas, with a same logical area. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to associate permanently at least two physical areas of said memory called mirror areas, with a same logical area in the system of Ban, because a permanent is a special temporal case of dynamic (*if an association via a table is capable of changing, however throughout its entire life, the table is not changed then in fact the dynamically changeable table was actually permanent or fixed*) and permanent associating does not require complicated or complex control mechanisms for controlling the change of association.

Robinson discloses a card comprising an electronic module having information process means and a flash type non volatile memory (*abstract; title*).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use a card in the system of Ban, because Robinson teaches it as a way of encasing flash memory and logic circuitry to perform operations of storing and outputting data (*abstract*).

10. **Claims 14-17** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ban (WO 94/20906 hereinafter “Ban”) in view of Hazen et al. (WO 99/35650 hereinafter “Hazen”) as applied to **claims 5 and 6** above, and further in view of Assar et al. (WO 95/10083 hereinafter “Assar”).

Consider **claims 14 and 15**, and as applied to **claims 5 and 6** above, Ban in view of Hazen discloses the method comprising designating said active physical areas (*active unit made up of active blocks, FIG. 7; page 9, lines 27-30; page 10, line 1*).

However, Ban in view of Hazen does not disclose the method comprising designating said active physical areas using a counter and incrementing the counter on each change of active area.

Assar discloses a method comprising designating active physical areas using a counter (*counter 620 page 18, lines 26-page 19, line 1; page 20, line 17 and 26; counter 620 is used in conjunction with flags such as the used/free flag 112 and incrementing the counter on each change of active area (page 20, lines 10-19)*).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to designate active physical areas using a counter in the system of Ban in view of Hazen, because Assar teaches a counter is used to show the number of times a block has been erased and written (which areas are most and least worn out) in order to determine where to write next (*page 18, lines 26-28; abstract*).

Consider **claims 16 and 17**, and as applied to **claims 5 and 6** above, Ban in view of Hazen discloses the method of claims 5 and 6.

However, Ban in view of Hazen does not disclose the method comprising associating at least one bit with a logical area to represent the use state of at least one mirror physical area of said logical area.

Assar discloses a method comprising associating at least one bit (*one bit used flag 626, page 18, line 36*) with a logical area (*data block, page 18, lines 31-37*) to represent the use state of at least one mirror physical area of said logical area (*page 18, lines 35-37*).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to associate at least one bit with a logical area to represent the use state of at least one mirror physical area of said logical area in the system of Ban in view of Hazen, because Assar teaches used/free flag is used to avoid an erase-before-write cycle and therefore avoid the overhead of an erase cycle (*page 7, lines 9-21*).

11. **Claims 19-20, and 22** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ban (WO 94/20906 hereinafter “Ban”) in view of Hazen et al. (WO 99/35650 hereinafter “Hazen”) as applied to **claim 5 and 6** above, and further in view of Kuo (US Patent # 4763305 hereinafter “Kuo”).

Consider **claims 19 and 20**, and as applied to **claims 5 and 6** above, Ban in view of Hazen discloses wherein the write is carried out as claims 5 and 6 above.

However, Ban in view of Hazen does not disclose the method, wherein the write is carried out in an active physical area if the content of the logical area is identical to the content of the active physical area or when said write involves no erasure, the write is carried out in an active physical area, and in a blank physical area otherwise.

Kuo discloses a method, wherein a write is carried out in an active physical area if the content of the logical area is identical to the content of the active physical area (*if data in the area is the same as the data to be written, then avoid the erase/program cycle the data and the write is complete for that area, column 6, lines 18-26*), and in a blank physical area otherwise (*if old data in byte or block is already in erased state or blank, or the data does not match so the physical area is erased or blank and then the write is performed; column 5, lines 62-68 and column 6, lines 18-30*).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include when the write is carried out in an active physical area if the content of the logical area is identical to the content of the active physical area or when said write involves no erasure, and in a blank physical area otherwise, in the system of Ban in view of Hazen, because Kuo teaches this saves the time normally required to perform the erase (*column 6, lines 29-30*).

Consider **claim 22**, and as applied to **claim 19** above, Ban in view of Hazen discloses the method comprising programming (*writing*) of the logical area in the blank physical area in claim 1.

However, Ban in view of Hazen does not disclose the method comprising programming only a portion of the logical area in the blank physical area.

Kuo discloses a method comprising programming only a portion of the logical area in the blank physical area (*only erase/program those areas which need to be, those areas that new data is same as old do not need to be erased and subsequently reprogrammed, column 5, lines 62-68 and column 6, lines 18-30*).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to be able to program only a portion of the logical area in the blank physical area in the system of Ban in view of Hazen, because Kuo teaches this saves the time normally required to perform the erase (*column 6, lines 29-30*).

12. **Claim 21** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ban (WO 94/20906 hereinafter “Ban”) in view of Assar et al. (WO 95/10083 hereinafter “Assar”) as applied to **claim 7** above, and further in view of Kuo (US Patent # 4763305 hereinafter “Kuo”).

Consider **claim 21**, and as applied to **claim 7** above, Ban in view of Assar discloses wherein the write is carried out as **claim 7** above.

However, Ban in view of Assar does not disclose the method, wherein the write is carried out in an active physical area if the content of the logical area is identical to the content of the active physical area or when said write involves no erasure, the write is carried out in an active physical area, and in a blank physical area otherwise.

Kuo discloses a method, wherein a write is carried out in an active physical area if the content of the logical area is identical to the content of the active physical area (*if data in the area is the same as the data to be written, then avoid the erase/program cycle the data and the write is complete for that area, column 6, lines 18-26*), and in a blank physical area otherwise (*if old data in byte or block is already in erased state or blank, or the data does not match so the physical area is erased or blank and then the write is performed; column 5, lines 62-68 and column 6, lines 18-30*).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include when the write is carried out in an active physical area if the content of the logical area is identical to the content of the active physical area or when said write involves no erasure, and in a blank physical area otherwise, in the system of Ban in view of Assar, because Kuo teaches this saves the time normally required to perform the erase (*column 6, lines 29-30*).

***Response to Arguments***

**Claim Rejection 35 USC 112, second paragraph**

13. Applicant requested that the Examiner provide at least one example of problems with the claims (*page 13 of 18*). Examiner points to the previous office action's rejections under 35 USC § 112 (*insufficient antecedent basis rejections as examples: pages 2-4*).

**35 USC 102**

14. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, and 11-13 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

**35 USC 103**

15. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 2-9, 14-31 that the claims are allowable for the same reasons 1 and 13 are allowable since claims 2-9 and 14-31 either depend directly or indirectly on claim 1 or 13, have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

***Conclusion***

16. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP

§ 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

17. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Matthew R. Chrzanowski whose telephone number is (571) 270-1176. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Th 7:30am-5:00pm, Every other Friday 7:30am-4pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Matt Kim can be reached on 571-272-4182. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2186

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Matthew R Chrzanowski  
Examiner  
Art Unit 2186

07/23/2007

/MC/

*SK*  
1/25/01

MATTHEW KIM  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100